



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/577,071 | 05/23/2000 | Gabriel Jakobson | 99-852 | 4170 |

32127 7590 01/19/2005

VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.
C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN
600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE
MAILCODE HQEO3H14
IRVING, TX 75038

EXAMINER

ZHEN, LI B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Advisory Action | Applicant(s) 09/577,071 | Applicant(s) JAKOBSON ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Li B. Zhen | Art Unit 2126 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 03 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-33.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☒ Other: interview summary attached


MENG-AL T. AN
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16 - 33 is not persuasive.

In response to the Final Office Action dated 10/01/2004, applicant argues that Lauer does not disclose an "event correlation service" that is "adapted to: receive said parsed event from said event notification service; utilize data stored in said knowledge database to derive an event from said parsed event; and transmit said derived event to one of a plurality of operator workstations via said event notification service, regardless of a significance of said derived event" [p. 4, lines 2 - 7]. Examiner agrees with applicant's argument with regards to the Lauer reference. However, only claim 1 recited the argued limitations listed above. Therefore, applicant arguments did not overcome the rejections for claims 16 - 33. In addition, the claims 1 - 33 would be rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1 - 17 of U. S. Patent No. 6766368 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent. In an interview with applicant's representative, Mr. Joel Wall, on January 12, 2005, Mr. Wall suggested that examiner issue an advisory action for the communication filed December 3, 2004 and in response he will file a terminal disclaimer for the double patenting rejection and cancel the non-allowable claims, 16 - 33 and may pursue the cancel claims in a continuing application.